



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,547	11/20/2001	Kazuhiro Nanbu	FUJY 19.187	7570
26304	7590	05/09/2005	EXAMINER	
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP			MCALLISTER, STEVEN B	
575 MADISON AVENUE			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			PAPER NUMBER	

3627

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/989,547	NANBU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven B. McAllister	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13,16-25 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13,16-25 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Note Regarding Examination

In the previous Office Action of 9/9/2004, it was noted that certain subject matter was old and well known in the art. As directed by 2144.03(c) the statements that the subject matter is old and well known are taken to be admitted prior art since no traversal of the statements was not presented in the subsequent reply of 2/9/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11-13, 16, 17, 23-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buettgenbach et al (2002/0032613), hereafter "613", in view of Walker et al (6,754,636).

As to claims 1 and 13, '613 shows receiving from the virtual shop order data and pickup location data (which the buyer notified the shop of) via a receiving unit (e.g., par. 0040, 0048); issuing identification on the basis of having received the order information via an issuing unit (e.g., par. 0071); and confirming the identification information via a confirmation unit; and setting the identification information so as to contain numerals of the buyers phone number, comprising using the entire phone number (e.g., par. 54)..

Art Unit: 3627

'613 does not explicitly show that the identification information issued to the buyer is unique to both the buyer and transaction, or that the issuing unit generates the identification information via a one-way function on the basis of the order information received. Walker et al show providing identification information unique to the buyer and transaction (e.g., Fig. 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of '613 as taught by Walker et al in order to provide greater security (for instance, each time a locker is used a new ID number is used, so previous users cannot re-enter it; and losing a tangible item having the number in or on it can result only in the loss of one package rather than the repeated loss of packages).

As to generation of the identification information via a one way function, it is notoriously old and well known in the art to do so. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide identification based on a one way function in order preserve the integrity of the original data.

As to claims 4 and 16, Walker shows confirming the identification information via a POS terminal.

As to claims 5 and 17, '613 in view of Walker et al show using a smart card.

As to claims 11 and 23, '613 in view of Walker et al show all steps except erasing the data when legal. However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art to erase such data when legal in order to minimize the amount of data held in long term storage and therefore reduce costs.

As to claims 12 and 24, '613 in view of Walker et al show receiving a piece of completion information and notifying the virtual shop of the completion, and notifying a settlement institution of information about payment.

As to claims 25, it is noted that '613 in view of Walker et al show software performing the recited steps.

Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '613 in view of Walker et al as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Zarovinsky (2002/0133415).

'613 in view of Walker et al show all elements of the claims except providing a list of receiving locations to the e-shop. Zarovinsky shows the e-shop providing a list of receiving location for the buyer to choose from (par. 48). It is inherent therefore that this information was provided to the e-shop. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts to further modify the method of '613 by providing a list of locations as taught by Zarovinsky in order to ease determining where to ship for the buyer, and to gain more business.

Claims 7-10 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '613 in view of Walker et al as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of "Re: Astropix Wholesale Optics", hereafter "Astropix".

'613 in view of Walker et al show all elements of the claim except notifying of a request for delivery and receiving a tracking number as a reply. Astropix shows these elements. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the method of '613 by sending a delivery request and receiving a tracking number in order to ensure that the shipment can be tracked.

As to claims 8 and 20, '613 in view of Walker et al and Astropix shows all elements except putting a merchant on a blacklist and notify the customer. However, to do so is notoriously old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the method of '613 by doing so in order to keep the customer apprised and to avoid bad business dealings in the future.

As to claims 9 and 21, '613 in view of Walker et al and Astropix shows all elements except providing the information when delivery response is received. However, to do so is notoriously old in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such information at the earliest time in order to provide the buyer with the opportunity to plan his time.

As to claims, 10 and 22, it is noted that '613 in view of Walker et al and Astropix shows all elements. It is noted that the server 214 of '613 is located centrally, away from any one shipping agent's location, and that any information sent to or from the agent's location is therefore forwarded by the server to that location.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/9/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 3627

Applicant argues that the 103 rejection is improper because elements (a) and (b) are lacking from the combination. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Element (a) is presented as subject matter which is notoriously old and well known in the art. The Applicant has not traversed this statement, and it is taken as admitted prior art pursuant to MPEP 2144.03(c).

Element (b) is presented in the references, as noted in the rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. McAllister whose telephone number is (703) 308-7052. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8-6:30.

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P. Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Steven B. McAllister

Steven B. McAllister
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3627

STEVE B. MCALLISTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER